

**REMARKS**

The Examiner is thanked for carefully reviewing the present application. The present amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed on January 24, 2006 regarding claims 1-20. The applicants have thoroughly reviewed the outstanding Office Action including the Examiner's remarks and the references cited therein. The following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action and render all claims at issue patentably distinguishable over cited references.

Favorable reconsideration is requested in view of the following remarks.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102**

1. Claims 1-5 and 7-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Marola (2,897,022) (hereinafter referred to as "Marola"). These rejections are respectfully traversed. As will be fully explained below, it is respectfully submitted that Marola does not anticipate the claimed features of the present application, and the applicants respectfully request that the section 102(b) rejections be withdrawn.

As recited in claims 1, 9 and 14, the present application is

directed to a coupling structure for serially coupling two motors, comprising: two bearing sleeves each formed with at least one groove and respectively disposed in the two motors; a connector having a first end and an opposed second end, the first end and the second end each formed with at least one groove; and at least two elastic fastener, each of which fits into the groove of the connector at one of the two ends and received in the groove formed on one of the two bearing sleeve. In claim 9, the elastic fasteners are ring-shaped elastic fasteners, each of which has an inner edge fit into the groove formed on the connector and an outer edge received in the groove formed on the bearing sleeves. In claim 14, the connector is directly formed on one bearing sleeve as a connection part, and one elastic fastener is used.

In the claimed inventions recited in claims 1, 9 and 14, the bearing sleeves are respectively disposed in the two motors and are inherent parts of the motors for respectively covering the bearing of the motors. In the claimed inventions, two separate motors are serially coupled through the connection of the bearing sleeves inherently formed in the motors, one or two elastic fasteners and/or a connector. In claims 1 and 9, when the inner edges of the elastic fasteners are fit into the grooves formed at opposite ends of the connector, and the outer edges of elastic fasteners are received in the grooves of the two bearing sleeves, the two fan motors are serially coupled. In claim 14, the two motors are serially coupled by the the

bearing sleeves, elastic fastener and the connection part integrally formed on one of the bearing sleeves for substituting the separate connector recited in claims 1 and 9.

In Marola, a cam follower bearing assembly is disclosed, the cam follower bearing assembly comprises a stud shaft 7 forming an inner raceway 9 for a bearing, an outer race 11 surrounding the shaft 7, antifriction members 10 between the outer race 11 and shaft 7, a washer 13 fitted to each end of the outer race 11, a peripheral groove in the shaft 7 opposite each washer 13, a resilient split ring 20 carried by each groove 15/16 and engaging the adjacent washer 13, such as shown in FIG. 1. The stud shaft 7, the screw threaded end 8 and the inner raceway 9 are different portions of the same shaft, the shaft is attached to a base by the screw threaded end 8, and the stud shaft 7 are connected with the rollers 10, so that the structure shown in FIG. 1 disclosed by Marola is a single roller but not a tandem motor composed of a plurality of motors.

The stud shaft 7, which forms an inner raceway 9 for a bearing, is a part of a single roller, and the two washers 13 are respectively fitted to the grooves formed at the stud shaft 7 in the single roller, such as shown in FIG. 1 disclosed by Marola. The structure shown in FIGs. 1-6 disclosed by Marola is a portion of a single roller structure not a tandem motor composed of two serially coupling motors, and the two washers 13 both are fitted to the one single roller. However, in the claimed inventions of the present

application, a coupling structure for serially coupling two motors is disclosed, and the two bearing sleeves of the coupling structure are inherent parts of the two motors. Furthermore, it is known by a person skilled in the art that the washer is a kind of auxiliary component using between two members in connecting to increase the connection intensity of the two members, and the bearing sleeve is a kind of cover for covering the bearing of the motor therein. It is obvious that the washer is not used to cover a bearing, and the washer cannot substitute the bearing sleeve in the motors of the claimed inventions. Moreover, since the coupling structure disclosed by Marola is two washers 13 engaged with one single stud shaft 7, and the stud shaft 7 forms an inner raceway 9 for a bearing, the coupling structure cannot serially couple two separate motors. Additionally, according to the full description in Marola, there is no suggestion or teaching about that the two washers 13 are respectively deposited in two motors completely. On the contrary, the application of Marola relates to improvements in a shaft mounting for a washer which prevents the latter from rotation relative to the shaft, and the washers 13 are fitted to the one single shaft 7, such as shown in FIG. 1. Apparently, the coupling structure described by Marola is entirely different from that of the present application, and the technique disclosed by Marola cannot achieve the effect of the claimed inventions, which serially connecting two separate motors.

Therefore, Marola fails to disclose or anticipate the technique

features of claims 1, 9 and 14, and the claims 1, 9 and 14 are allowable.

Since claims 1, 9 and 14 are allowable, dependent claims 2-5 and 7-8 each of which depends from independent claim 1, dependent claims 10-13 each of which depends from independent claim 9, and dependent claims 15-18 each of which depends from independent claim 14 are likewise believed to be allowable. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that the section 102(b) rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

1. Claims 6, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Marola. These rejections are respectfully traversed. As will be fully explained below, it is respectfully submitted that Marola does not render the claimed invention obvious, and the applicants respectfully request that the section 103(a) rejection be withdrawn.

Just as the aforementioned description, since the independent claims 1 and 14 are allowable, the dependent claim 6 depending from independent claim 1, and the dependent claims 19 and 20 each of which depends from the independent claim 14 are likewise believed to be allowable. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that the section 103(a) rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn.